



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

local, the treatment is not so satisfactory. The details of extravagance and corruption are well marshalled, likewise the rise of the Ku Klux, Holden's use of force, and the resulting impeachment. But the frequent use of oral tradition as authoritative, the continual reliance on the leading conservative newspaper, whose editor was probably mentally deranged, and a warm sympathy with the struggle for redemption from radical misrule, leave the impression that mercy is never offered the reconstructionists and that in some cases extenuating circumstances are not duly considered. A distinct contribution to knowledge of the period after 1868 is the revelation of the cleavage within the Republican party and the use of federal patronage especially in the elections of 1872.

A singular omission among the sources for the period is the Johnson manuscripts in the Library of Congress, which are illuminating for affairs in North Carolina from 1865 to 1867. There is no bibliography and the map is misleading with respect to railway lines in operation in 1865. The style is superior to that of the average work of its class, riveting attention to matters of minor as well as of major importance.

WM. K. BOYD.

The Anthracite Coal Combination in the United States: with some Account of the Early Development of the Anthracite Industry.
By ELIOT JONES, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics, State University of Iowa. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. XI.]
(Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 261.)

Is there an anthracite coal "combination"? In his selection of a title for his book, Dr. Jones assumes that there is; and in his preface he says: "This combination controlling the anthracite coal trade is found to be a combination of railroads, owning either directly, or indirectly through subsidiary coal companies, substantially the entire area of the anthracite coal deposits of the United States."

This charge of "a *general combination* to control the anthracite coal industry", said the Supreme Court, deciding the government's anti-trust suit against the Reading Company and other anthracite railroads, is "the theory upon which the bill is framed and upon which the case has been presented" (*United States v. Reading Company*, 226 U. S. 324, 343, 1912). The Supreme Court in this case held that this charge was not established. Absence of "*documentary* evidence of solidarity", which Dr. Jones implies was the determining fact, was really only one of the considerations. "We have gone through the record", said the Supreme Court (*ibid.*, p. 346). "The acts and transactions which the bill avers to have been committed by some of the defendants in furtherance of the illegal plan and scheme of a general combination" (*ibid.*, p. 371) and which, the Supreme Court decided, did not establish any such *general combination*, are variously characterized by Dr. Jones

as "persistent efforts . . . to restrict or eliminate competition" and as "the development of an effective combination". This was the view which the government had urged upon the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, held otherwise. "The accomplishment of these several subordinate transactions", said the Supreme Court, "only completed one or another of the several groups of carriers and coal-producing companies, which several groups were thereafter not only possessed of the power to compete with every other group, but, as we have already seen, were actually engaged in competing, one with another, prior to the general combination through the Temple Iron Company and the sixty-five per cent. contract scheme" (*ibid.*, p. 372). To similar purpose were the remarks of the court on the agreement of 1896, on the absorption of the New York, Susquehanna, and Western Railroad by the Erie, and on the acquisition of the Central Railroad of New Jersey by the Reading Company.

The only transactions which the Supreme Court found to support the charge of a *general combination* were the Temple Iron Company acquisitions and the sixty-five per cent. contracts. Dr. Jones's discussion of these is excellent. With the sale of the Temple Iron Company's property, however, and the cancellation of the sixty-five per cent. contracts, pursuant to the decree of the court, there remained, according to the Supreme Court, no general combination controlling the anthracite coal trade, such as Dr. Jones assumes; but, at the worst, only "several groups of carriers and coal-producing companies", each of which may or may not offend against the Sherman Act—the Supreme Court expressly left this point undecided—but which were all independent of each other and "were not steps or acts in furtherance of any general scheme" and were "not only possessed of the power to compete with every other group, but . . . were actually engaged in competing, one with another". These independent "groups of carriers and coal-producing companies" all apparently resumed this status after the sale of the Temple Iron Company's property and the cancellation of the sixty-five per cent. contracts.

The problem, therefore, is not that of a "combination controlling the anthracite coal trade"; nor is the government endeavoring, as Dr. Jones concludes, "to effect the dissolution of the anthracite coal combination". The problem is the relation of carrier, coal-producing company, and coal-selling company within each of several independent groups; and the government is now endeavoring, so far as possible, to disintegrate still further each group and each party in each group. Very scantily Dr. Jones has indicated the practical economic grounds on which the separate groups are now resisting further disintegration. That these grounds are substantial appears from the fact that upon them the government has lost every case thus far tried (*United States v. Delaware L. and W. R. Co.*, 213 Fed. 240, D. C. N. J., 1914; *United States v. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company*, D. C. S. D. N. Y., 1915, not yet reported).

That these grounds are less technical and more practical, and that the parties in these separate groups are acting in better faith than Dr. Jones thinks, is clear from the reasoning of all the decisions thus far rendered in these latest government suits.

GILBERT HOLLAND MONTAGUE.

MINOR NOTICES

La Confederazione Achea. Per Giovanni Niccolini. [Biblioteca degli Studi Storici, I.] (Pavia, Mattei e Compagnia, 1914, pp. xii, 348.) Niccolini's *La Confederazione Achea*, a recent contribution to the study of the Hellenistic period of Greek history, had been foreshadowed by a series of monographs appearing since 1908 in the *Studi Storici per la Antichità Classica*, which have to a certain degree laid the foundations for this present work.

In his introduction the author justifies his choice of the word "confederacy" rather than "league" on the ground that the former implies an alliance creating a new political organism, with its own magistrates and assemblies, and more closely corresponds to the Polybian *συνπολιτεία*, whereas the latter more accurately translates *συνμαχία*. The introduction likewise contains a brief critical estimate of the sources for the history of the Confederacy, with special attention to the chief authority, Polybius. The political history of the Achaians from 280 to 146 B. C. is traced in the five opening chapters, throughout which special stress is laid upon Achaio-Macedonian and Achaio-Roman relations. Due prominence is given to the careers of Aratus and Philopoemen. It was the former who brought Sicyon into the Confederacy (251), thereby changing the character of the union and giving it the first impetus to expansion beyond the ethnic unity of the Achaians. To Aratus also, whom Niccolini holds to have been poisoned by Philip V. in 213, is given the credit for having founded the greatness of the Confederacy and indicated how it should be preserved. Philopoemen strove to repair the military weakness of the Achaians, remove the special privileges of cities, break up the larger states into smaller units, and maintain a dignified attitude towards Rome. With an almost Thucydidean concentration on purely political activities, Niccolini attempts no moral judgments, considering results more essential than means, and thus fails to give as complete a characterization of Aratus as appears, *e. g.* in Tarn's *Antigonos Gonatas*, a book which, although of importance for Achaio-Macedonian history from 280 to 240, he ignores. The sixth chapter deals with the federal constitution and the organs of the central authority, the finances and military organization, as well as the rights of the individual communities within the Confederacy. The concluding chapter is devoted to a study of the chronology from 280 to 146, determining the relation of the Achaian to the Olympic year in Polybius and, as far as possible, the dates of the Achaian *strategoi*, of whom a tabu-